| 1 | 2 |
|---|---|
| 104 | Andhra Pradesh Paper Mills Ltd. |
| 105 | Pure Drinks (P) Ltd. |
| 106 | Mc. Dowell & Co. Ltd |
| 107 | M. R. F. Ltd. |
| 108 | Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corpn. Ltd. |
| 109 | South India Viscose Ltd. |
| 110 | R. B. Shreeram Durgaprasad (P) Ltd. |
| 111 | Machinery Manufacturer Corp. Ltd. |
| 112 | Oberoi Hotles (P) Ltd. |
| 113 | Badhulipur Tea Co. Ltd. |
| 114 | National Insurance Co. Ltd. |
| 115 | Annapurna Credit Co. |
| 116 | Jiyajee Cotton Mills Ltd. |
| 117 | Kanoria Chemical & Industries Ltd. |
| 118 | Straw Products Ltd. |
| 119 | Tata Tea Ltd. |

**Overseas construction projects cleared I)}' Export import bank**

1644. SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the value of bids for overseas construction projects cleared by the working group of the Export-Import Bank in 1983, 1984 and 1985 for each country separately.

(b) what is the value of bids which resulted in contracts for each of the above years and each country separately;

(c) whether it is fact that the success ratio is very low; if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(d) what is the general critreia followed by the working group for the clearance of the construction project bids and what are the changes in norms, if any, in case of Iraq and Libya; and

(e) what is the contract value along-with the names of the contractor and client, contract signing date and project outline in case erf such bids which became contracts in 1985?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI). (a) to (c) The details of total value of bids of oveseas construction projects cleared by the Working Ggoup of the Export Import Bank of India - and the contracts secured out of bids cleared during the years 1983, 1984, 1985 are set out in Statements I and II. The main reason of low succes ratio is that the largest number of bids by the Indian companies have been for projects in the Gulf region wherein construction activity has reportedly slowed down, resulting in fewer tenders coupled with difficult payment situation. The capacity of Indian contractors to contend with payment difficulties is limited. Further, the general recesson of economic activity in developed countries has made the companies in those countries to look for openings in GuIf|African countries which has resulted in stiff competition for the Indian companies from European and Japanese companies.

(d) The Working Group follows the guilelines laid down by Reserve Bank of India which include —

(i) consideration of financial status of exporter.

(ii) financial & technical viability of projects.

(iii) payment terms, (iv) security for payments, (v) protective clauses, (vi) parameters such as financial facility required.

(vii) exposure limits of each country and of each company.

(viii) credit insurance and country rating assesed by ECGC.

In the case of construction projects in Libya, no change in the norms has been made. As regards construction projects in Iraq the Indian contractors have been enabled to offer deferred terms so as to

maintain their competitiveness in relation to international competiton.

(e) In terms of the provsions of the Public Financial Institutions (Obligation as to Fidelity and Secrecy) Act, 1983 and other relevant statutes governing the public sector financial institutions and banks, information relating to the individual constituents of financial institutions and banks cannot be disclosed.

**Statement-I**

***Value of bids of overseas Construction Projects cleared by the Working Group of Export-Import Bank of India***

(Rs. in crores)

| | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Algeria | 724 | 607 | 400 |
| 2 A. R. E. | — | 30 | — |
| 3 Djiobati | — | 10 | — |
| 4 Ethiopia | — | 45 | — |
| 5. Libya. | 14 | 403 | 28 |
| 6. Mozambique | — | 44 | — |
| 7. Seychelles | — | 17 | — |
| 8. Tunisia | — | 16 | — |
| 9. Uganda | — | 14 | — |
| 10. Zimbabwe | — | 21 | — |
| 11. Bangladesh | 47 | 42 | — |
| 12. Indonesia | 17 | 4 | — |
| 13. Maldives | — | 11 | 50 |
| 14. Nepal | 53 | 47 | 77 |
| 15. Srilanka | 34 | 28 | 7 |
| 16. Thailand | 88 | 12 | — |
| 17. Bahrain | — | 96 | — |
| 18. Iraq | 164 | 940 | 1953 |
| 19 Jordan | 20 | 24 | 35 |
| 20. Kuwait | 120 | 19 | 233 |
| 21. Oman | 60 | 29 | — |
| 22. Qatar | — | 13 | 81 |
| 23. Saudia Arabia | 79 | 244 | 13 |
| 24. YAR. | 294 | 463 | 31 |
| 25. Soloman Island | — | — | 10 |
| 26. South Yemen | — | — | 11 |
| 27. Madgascar. | — | — | 25 |

| | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28. Iran | 669 | — | 314 |
| 29. Maritius | — | — | 7 |
| 30. Hongkong | — | — | 34 |
| 31. Laos | — | — | 3 |
| 32. Kenya | 33 | — | 23 |
| 33. Brunei | 27 | — | — |
| 34. Tanzznia | 11 | — | — |
| 35. Malaysia | 94 | — | — |
| 36. Syria. | 313 | — | — |
| TOTAL | 2861 | 3175 | 3315 |

**Statement-II**

*Value of contracts secured out bids cleared by the Working Group of EXIM. Bank*

(Rs. crores)

| | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Algeria | 81 | | 214 |
| 2. Irag | 34 | 335 | |
| 3. Jordan | — | — | 17 |
| 4. Kuwait | 58 | — | 3 |
| 5. Libya | 5 | 17 | — |
| 6. Nepal | 7 | — | — |
| 7. Qatsr | — | — | 3 |
| 8. Saud Arabia | 33 | — | — |
| 9. Srilanka | 7 | 2 | — |
| 10. YAR. | 26 | 14 | — |
| TOTAL | 251 | 368 | 237 |